

Transmission of Nutrient in Urban Environment

**By
Jinnat Ara**



**Submitted in fulfilment for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

**Faculty of Engineering
University of Technology, Sydney (UTS)**

Australia

2014

Certificate

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree, nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree. I also certify that this thesis is my own work and it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where due acknowledgement is made in the text.

Signature of Candidate



Abstract

Gross pollutant traps (GPT) are installed in many urban drainage systems in Australia to control stormwater pollutants from urban catchments. Stormwater pollutants (e.g. leaf litter) are trapped in the GPT during stormwater runoff events. If these devices are not managed properly, they may lead to deterioration of receiving water quality by introducing nutrients (phosphorus and nitrogen) from the leaf litter during dry weather periods between events. This study evaluated the release of nutrients from leaf litter in a GPT system and a novel conceptual model was developed for the prediction of phosphorus at the outlet of GPT. Catchment runoff and mathematical model were used to create an integrated model able to predict the phosphorus response from a GPT. The knowledge gained in this research is expected to contribute to improve understanding the impact of GPT on downstream water bodies.

Leaf litter collected from Centennial Park was found to be a significant source of nitrogen and phosphorus where the total nitrogen (TN) and total phosphorus (TP) content were 5.1 mg g⁻¹ and 0.381 mg g⁻¹ respectively. The releases of TN and TP from leaf litter were determined by considering a GPT environment. Initially, the phosphorus release declined exponentially with time. Consideration of the results indicated that the rate of phosphorus release was 0.0274 d⁻¹ for the first 90 days and the release rate was 0.0195 d⁻¹ for 180 days. Measured higher phosphorous release rate (90 days) was used to develop conceptual model. The quantity of TP loss from leaf litter was ~88% of the P in the leaf litter for the first 90 days and ~6% for the second 90 days. This suggests that the initial rapid TP release was due to higher rate of leaching of phosphorus. It was observed that the variation of phosphorus release from GPT is associated with the quantity of trapped leaf litter and

inter-event dry period. The study also found that longer retention time released more phosphorus confirming the degradation of leaf litter.

Results showed that the TP released from leaf litter was faster than the release of TN. About 54% of the total phosphorus was released while 20% of the total nitrogen was released within the same time frame (22 days). This suggests that nitrogen released at a slower rate. The change of pH, increase in electrical conductivity (EC) and decrease in dissolved oxygen (DO) further confirmed the decomposition of leaf matrix.

As part of this study, a model of catchment runoff quantity and quality was used. This model was based on the Stormwater Management Model (SWMM) and was used to consider different factors influencing stormwater quantity and quality from the catchment. In this study, different rainfall temporal patterns were used to investigate the influence of rainfall characteristics on catchment runoff. It was found that the predicted peak flow and loss varied significantly with rainfall temporal patterns. The rainfall loss increased and the rainfall loss rate decreased with storm duration. Furthermore, it was found that the runoff volume generated by 1 year ARI was enough to replace the volume of water stored within GPT. Therefore, rainfall events with 1 year ARI and durations of 5, 10, 20, 30, 45, 60 and 120 min were considered to determine the inlet hydrograph for the GPT.

Appropriate model was developed for quantification of phosphorus, in particular the TP released from leaf litter in GPT system. The SWMM model was applied to determine the catchment runoff flow in GPT which enabled estimating of phosphorus in the stormwater runoff. The catchment runoff was used as inflow to the GPT while the out flow was

obtained from level pool routing of flow through the GPT. Model simulation results showed that the predicted total phosphorus load from decay of the leaf litter in the GPT was transported downstream for most storm events.

This confirmed that novel conceptual model developed in this study is capable to estimate outlet phosphorus concentration of GPT for different storm events. This information may be useful to recommend catchment management approaches to improve water quality and to set management priorities and thereby enhance the design of stormwater management systems. Hence, the results of this research have shown that catchment management need to consider leaf litter as a source of phosphorus and nitrogen in assessing downstream receiving water quality.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my greatest appreciation to my principal supervisor, Associate Professor James Edward Ball, for his guidance, continuous encouragement and support throughout this study. I would like to thank Professor Saravanmuthu Vigneswaran, Dr. Pamela Hazelton and my co-supervisor Associate Professor Huu Hao Ngo for their valuable and thoughtful suggestions. Thanks are extended to Dr. Robert McLaughlan for his support and Dr. Shon for encouragement.

I am grateful for financial support from Rocla Water Pty. Ltd. I would like to thank my colleagues Wen, Guo, Zuthi, Preeti and Chinu. I wish to thank the academic and technical staff in the University of Technology Sydney (UTS) to their support especially Phyllis Agius, Sumathy Venkatesh, David Hooper and Rami Haddad.

Finally, this thesis is dedicated to my husband S M Ghausul Hossain for his generosity and help. My special thanks to my mother Jahanara Begum, daughter Lamia Nureen, son Yusuf Mahdi and all family member.

Table of Contents

CERTIFICATE	I
ABSTRACT	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	V
TABLE OF CONTENTS	VI
ABBREVIATIONS	X
NOMENCLATURE	XI
LIST OF FIGURES	XIII
LIST OF TABLES	XVI
1 INTRODUCTION	2
1.1 Introduction	2
1.2 Research objectives	4
1.3 Novel aspects of study	5
1.4 Thesis outline	5
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	8
2.1 Introduction	8
2.2 Urban stormwater runoff	8
2.2.1 Runoff quantity	9
2.2.2 Runoff quality	10
2.3 Stormwater pollutants	12
2.3.1 Gross pollutants	12
2.3.2 Nutrients	14
2.3.3 Nutrients (phosphorus and nitrogen) in leaf litter	15
2.3.4 Leaf litter decomposition	16
2.3.5 Leaf litter decay model	17
	vi

2.3.6 Phosphorus and nitrogen release from leaf litter	18
2.3.7 Partitioning	19
2.3.8 Conversion between forms	21
2.3.9 Stormwater pollutant load	23
2.4 Urban catchment modelling	24
2.4.1 Model concept	26
2.4.2 Model classification	28
2.4.3 Modelling methods	34
2.5 Stormwater management	42
2.5.1 Gross Pollutant Traps (GPTs)	44
2.5.2 Continuous Deflective Separation (CDS)	45
2.5.3 Impacts of GPT on receiving water quality	47
2.5.4 GPT modelling	49
2.6 Summary	50
3 DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AREA	53
3.1 Introduction	53
3.2 Location	53
3.3 Catchment details	54
3.3.1 Introduction	54
3.3.2 Topography	54
3.3.3 Geology	57
3.3.4 Vegetation	58
3.3.5 Ponds	59
3.3.6 Land uses	60
3.3.7 Drainage system	63
3.3.8 GPT	66
3.4 Meteorological information	67
3.4.1 Precipitation data	67
3.4.2 Inter-Event dry period	70
3.4.3 Evaporation data	72
3.5 Flow data	72
3.6 Summary	73
4 STORM WATER MANAGEMENT MODEL	76

4.1 Introduction	76
4.2 SWMM blocks	76
4.3 Water quantity modelling	80
4.4 Water quality modelling	82
4.5 Calibration and validation	86
4.6 Implementation of SWMM	92
4.6.1 Subcatchments	92
4.6.2 Selected storm events	94
4.6.3 Calibration of SWMM	95
4.7 Summary	97
 5 NUTRIENT RELEASE FROM LEAF LITTER IN GROSS POLLUTANT TRAP	 99
5.1 Introduction	99
5.2 Methodology	100
5.2.1 Leaf litter collection	100
5.2.2 Leaf sample preparation	100
5.2.3 Leaf litter leaching experiment	101
5.2.4 Instrument, equipment and chemicals	102
5.2.5 Analytical method	102
5.2.6 Data Analysis	103
5.3 Results and discussion	104
5.3.1 Phosphorus release from leaf litter	105
5.3.2 Nitrogen release from leaf litter	108
5.3.3 Change of pH, conductivity and dissolved oxygen	111
5.4 Conclusions	114
 6 RUNOFF VARIABILITY	 117
6.1 Introduction	117
6.2 Catchment modelling system	118
6.2.1 Alternative Loss model	119
6.2.2 Alternative rainfall model	122
6.3 Results and discussion	124
6.3.1 Variability of rainfall losses	125

6.3.2 Variability in peak flows	135
6.3.3 Estimation of GPT and catchment runoff volume	138
6.4 Conclusions	140
7 PHOSPHORUS MODELLING IN GPT	142
7.1 Introduction	142
7.2 GPT modelling	142
7.2.1 Conceptual model of GPT	144
7.2.2 Phosphorus model for GPT	146
7.3 Application of model	150
7.3.1 Flow scenarios	150
7.3.2 Phosphorus scenarios	157
7.4 Results and discussion	159
7.5 Conclusions	164
8 CONCLUSIONS	167
8.1 Introduction	167
8.2 Conclusions	169
8.3 Research contribution	171
8.4 Future research needs	172
REFERENCES	173
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	194
APPENDICES	195
APPENDIX A	196
APPENDIX B	198
APPENDIX C	204

Abbreviations

AHD	Australian Height Datum
APHA	American Public Health Association
ARE	Absolute Relative Error
ARI	Average Recurrence Interval
ARMCANZ	Agriculture and Resource Management Council of Australia and New Zealand
ARR	Australian Rainfall & Runoff
BMP	Best Management Practice
CDS	Continuous Deflective Separation
CV	Coefficient of Variance
EC	Electrical Conductivity
EMC	Event Mean Concentration
DIP	Dissolved Inorganic Phosphorus
DOP	Dissolved Organic Phosphorus
GPT	Gross Pollutant Trap
N	Nitrogen
P	Phosphorus
PP	Particulate Phosphorus
TN	Total Nitrogen
TP	Total Phosphorus
TSP	Total Soluble Phosphorus
SD	Standard Deviation
SWMM	Storm Water Management Model
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency

Nomenclature

X	mass of dry matter remaining at time t
X_0	initial mass of dry matter
k	decomposition rate constant
Q_{GI}	inflow in GPT during time Δt , $m^3 s^{-1}$
Q_{GO}	outflow in GPT during time Δt , $m^3 s^{-1}$
Δt	time step, s
V	volume of water in GPT, m^3
Q_1^I	inflow in GPT at the beginning of time step Δt , $m^3 s^{-1}$
Q_2^I	inflow in GPT at the end of time step Δt , $m^3 s^{-1}$
Q_1^O	outflow in GPT at the beginning of time step Δt , $m^3 s^{-1}$
Q_2^O	outflow in GPT at the end of time step Δt , $m^3 s^{-1}$
V_1	volume of water in GPT at the beginning of time step Δt , m^3
V_2	volume of water in GPT at the end of time step Δt , m^3
C_1^G	concentration of P in GPT at the beginning of time step Δt , $mg L^{-1}$
C_2^G	concentration of P in GPT at the end of time step Δt , $mg L^{-1}$
C_1^I	concentration of P at inlet of GPT at the beginning of time step Δt , $mg L^{-1}$
C_2^I	concentration of P at inlet of GPT at the end of time step Δt , $mg L^{-1}$
C_1^O	concentration of P at outlet of GPT at the beginning of time step Δt , $mg L^{-1}$
C_2^O	concentration of P at outlet of GPT at the end of time step Δt , $mg L^{-1}$
P_{LL}	mass of P release from leaf litter in GPT at Δt , mg
P_{LL1}	P release from leaf litter at the beginning of time step Δt

P_{LL2}	P release from leaf litter at the end of time step Δt
ΔP	change in mass of P in GPT mg
P_{GI}	mass of P entering in GPT at Δt , mg
P_{GO}	mass of P leaving GPT at Δt , mg
S	storage, m^3
A	wetted cross-sectional area, m^2
R	hydraulic radius
n	Manning's roughness co-efficient

List of Figures

	Page No.
Figure 2.1 Runoff hydrograph before and after urbanisation (adapted from Kibler, 1982)	10
Figure 2.2 Typical decay curve of litter mass loss over time (Rovira and Rovira, 2010)	18
Figure 2.3 Phosphorus cycle (USEPA, 2000)	22
Figure 2.4 Four conceptual components of a catchment modelling system (Ball, 1992)	27
Figure 2.5 Desirable design ranges for treatment measures and pollutant sizes (Adapted from CSIRO, 1999)	44
Figure 2.6 Continuous deflective separation technologies (CDS Technologies, 2007)	46
Figure 3.1 Location of Centennial Park catchment	54
Figure 3.2 Topographic map of the Centennial Park catchment	56
Figure 3.3 Geological map of Botany Basin, Sydney	58
Figure 3.4 Centennial Park pond systems	60
Figure 3.5 Land use zoning in Centennial Park catchment	62
Figure 3.6 Stormwater drainage systems in Centennial Park catchment	65
Figure 3.7 Vertical Section of CDS Gross Pollutant Trap at the upstream of Musgrave Pond	66
Figure 3.8 Location of rain gauges in Centennial Park catchment (Umakhanthan and Ball, 2005)	69
Figure 3.9 Mean monthly rainfalls in Centennial Park catchment (Jan 1995 to Jan 2001)	69
Figure 3.10 Frequency of inter-event dry periods observed in 1859–2002 rainfall data	71
Figure 3.11 Probability density function of inter-event dry period (Gamma)	72
Figure 3.12 Musgrave Avenue stormwater channel rating curve	73

	Page No.
Figure 4.1 Model structure of computational blocks (Huber and Dickinson, 1988)	78
Figure 4.2 Overview of SWMM program structure (Huber and Dickinson, 1988)	79
Figure 4.3 Nonlinear reservoir model of a subcatchment (Huber and Dickinson, 1988)	80
Figure 4.4 Buildup equations of dust and dirt (Huber and Dickinson, 1988)	83
Figure 4.5 Runoff pollutant load characteristics curve (Alley, 1981)	85
Figure 4.6 Subcatchment boundaries in Centennial Park catchment	93
Figure 5.1 Total phosphorus remains in mixed leaves as dry mass	105
Figure 5.2 Degradation of phosphorus during leaf litter decomposition	107
Figure 5.3 Total nitrogen remains in mixed leaves as dry mass	109
Figure 5.4 Degradation of nitrogen during leaf litter decomposition	109
Figure 5.5 pH values of the water during the decomposition of leaf litter	112
Figure 5.6 Conductivity of the water during the decomposition of leaf litter	113
Figure 5.7 Dissolved oxygen of the water during the decomposition of leaf litter	113
Figure 6.1 Alternative loss model (Cordery, 1987)	121
Figure 6.2 Predicted and monitored flows for Nov. 1, 1994	124
Figure 6.3 Percentage rainfall loss for ARR pattern	128
Figure 6.4 Percentage rainfall loss for constant intensity of rainfall	128
Figure 6.5 Percentage rainfall loss for Convective Front loaded (CFL) pattern	129
Figure 6.6 Percentage rainfall loss for Convective Middle loaded (CML) pattern	129
Figure 6.7 Percentage rainfall loss for Convective Back loaded (CBL) pattern	130
Figure 6.8 Percentage rainfall loss for Frontal Front loaded (FFL) pattern	130
Figure 6.9 Percentage rainfall loss for Frontal Middle loaded (FML) pattern	131
Figure 6.10 Percentage rainfall loss for Frontal Back loaded (FBL) pattern	131

	Page No.
Figure 6.11 Variation of loss with temporal pattern for ARI 100 year	132
Figure 6.12 Variation of loss with temporal pattern for ARI 50 year	133
Figure 6.13 Variation of loss with temporal pattern ARI 20 year	133
Figure 6.14 Variation of loss with temporal pattern ARI 10 year	134
Figure 6.15 Variation of loss with temporal pattern for ARI 5 year	134
Figure 6.16 Variation of loss with temporal pattern for ARI 1 year	135
Figure 6.17 Range of predicted design flows for 100 year ARI	136
Figure 6.18 Standard deviation of the predicted peak flow for different ARI	137
Figure 6.19 Catchment runoff volume for different ARI	139
Figure 6.20 Frequency of catchment runoff volume	139
Figure 7.1 Conceptual model of phosphorus transportation through GPT	144
Figure 7.2 Cross-section of the GPT outlet	152
Figure 7.3 Mass of TP load in GPT with time for ARI 1 year, duration 5 min event	160
Figure 7.4 Mass of TP load in GPT with time for ARI 1 year, duration 10 min event	160
Figure 7.5 Mass of TP load in GPT with time for ARI 1 year, duration 20 min event	161
Figure 7.6 Mass of TP load in GPT with time for ARI 1 year, duration 30 min event	161
Figure 7.7 Mass of TP load in GPT with time for ARI 1 year, duration 45 min event	162
Figure 7.8 Mass of TP load in GPT with time for ARI 1 year, duration 60 min event	162
Figure 7.9 Mass of TP load in GPT with time for ARI 1 year, duration 120 min event	163

List of Tables

	Page No.
Table 2.1 Phosphorus partitions (Waller and Hart, 1986)	20
Table 2.2 Proportion of phosphorus transported in a particulate form	20
Table 3.1 Land use within the Centennial Park catchment (Modified from Choi and Ball, 2002)	60
Table 3.2 Main drainage system in Centennial Park catchment (Abustan, 1997)	64
Table 3.3 Rain gauging stations and the operation authorities in Centennial Park Catchment	68
Table 4.1 Subcatchment ID and area of Centennial Park catchment	94
Table 4.2 Characteristics of the selected storm events	95
Table 4.3 Statistical fit between observed and simulated runoff depth for calibrated events (Abustan, 1997)	96
Table 4.4 Statistical fit between observed and simulated peak flow for calibrated events (Abustan, 1997)	96
Table 5.1 Phosphorus release from leaf litter with time	106
Table 5.2 Decay constant of TP leached from leaf litter	107
Table 5.3 Nitrogen release from leaf litter with time	110
Table 5.4 Electrical conductivity (EC), pH and dissolved oxygen (DO) values in leachate samples during leaching experiment, 23°C	111
Table 6.1 Total precipitation loss for 100 year ARI	126
Table 6.2 Precipitation loss rate for 100 year ARI	127
Table 6.3 Normalised range of predicted peak flows for 100 year ARI	136
Table 6.4 Characteristics of predicted design flows for 100 year ARI	138
Table 7.1 Selected model parameters for GPT	150
Table 7.2 Stage and discharge of GPT at Centennial Park: cross-sectional area of flow = 1.91 m ² , hydraulic radius, R = 0.41m	153

	Page No.
Table 7.3 Storage-discharge relationship	155
Table 7.4 Relative error of inflow and outflow volume	157
Table 7.5 Phosphorus released from leaf litter in GPT at different inter-event dry periods	158
Table 7.6 Phosphorus released from different mass of leaf litter in GPT	159
Table 7.7 Mass of total phosphorus (TP) in catchment runoff (Abustan, 1997)	164